IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO.120 OF 2007

1.Mr.Ashok Pandurang Salunke,
2.Mr.Sayyad Nadim ...Petitioners.
Versus
1.The State of Maharashtra, &
2.Balaji Infotech - Partner;
Mr.Aniket Hingane. ...Respondents.

....

Mr.A.P.Kulkarni, Adv. for the Petitioners.
Mr.S.R.Saste, APP, for the State.
Mr.Parag Shelar, Adv. for Respondent No.2.

....

CORAM : SMT.V.K.TAHILRAMANI,J.

DATED : 2nd April, 2007.

P.C.:

1. Heard the learned Advocate for the Petitioners, the learned Advocate for respondent No.2-orig.complainant and the learned APP for the State. Respondent No.2-orig.complainant is present in-person before the Court. The learned Advocate for respondent No.2 undertakes to file Vakalatnama in two weeks. Undertaking is accepted.

2. By judgment and order dated 28.7.2005, the petitioners have been convicted under Section 138 of N.I.Act in S.C.C.NO.14993 of 2004. The appeal preferred by the petitioners has been dismissed.

Hence, this Revision.

3. The learned Advocate for respondent No.2-orig.complainant has stated that the complainant and the petitioners have amicably settled the matter and therefore the complaint filed by him and the proceedings relating thereto may be quashed. Affidavit of the complainant to the above effect is tendered. The said affidavit is taken on record.

4. In view of the statement of the complainant and his affidavit, the complaint and the proceedings relating thereto are quashed. The amount of Rs.20,000/- inclusive of the compensation amount of Rs.15,000/- be refunded to the petitioners, as stated by the complainant in his affidavit.

5. Revision Application is disposed of accordingly.

(SMT.V.K.TAHILRAMANI,J.)